



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/538,330	05/18/2006	Rune Freyer	2006-IP-019699 U1 USA	1607
49431	7590	01/21/2010		
SMITH IP SERVICES, P.C. P.O. Box 997 Rockwall, TX 75087			EXAMINER ANDREWS, DAVID L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3672	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/21/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mail@smithipservices.com
scrawford@smithipservices.com
sally@smithipservices.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/538,330	Applicant(s) FREYER, RUNE	
	Examiner David Andrews	Art Unit 3672	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 November 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4,6-8 and 10-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4,6-8 and 10-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 June 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

The amendments filed 10/9/2009 and 11/9/2009 have been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 11/9/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the combination of Lembcke and Laflin is improperly based on hindsight since there is no teaching or reason to substitute a swelling material in the packer of Lembcke. The examiner disagrees. The packer of Lembcke only relies on the longitudinal compression in order to expand the element (col. 2, lines 44-45). It is known in the art that a swelling material is an alternative material for expanding packers, as demonstrated by Laflin et al. One of ordinary skill would recognize the benefits of having a control line arrangement through a packer, such as that taught by Lembcke et al., and would recognize that it could be applied to other types of packers. The claimed invention only differs from that of Lembcke in the choice of packer material. Applicant also argues that one of ordinary skill could not predict the result of sealing around a wire using a swellable element. The examiner further disagrees since figures 1 and 2 or 1a and 2a show sealing arrangements with an expandable sealing element, such as that disclosed by Lembcke, and one of ordinary skill would recognize that substitution of a swelling material for the compression expanded material would result in the same sealing element expansion around the wire as shown and therefore the combination would have a predictable result.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lembcke et al. (US 6,173,788) in view of Laflin et al. (US 4,137,970). Lembcke et al. disclose a cable duct device in a swellable packer comprising: a swellable packer (12) adapted for sealing an annulus; at least one through going opening positioned between an inner surface and an outer surface of the packer adapted to constitute a duct for a cable (16, col. 2, lines 51-57; longitudinal bore or the longitudinal split gap); a slit extending between the through-going opening and an outer surface of the packer prior to actuation of the packer (col. 2, lines 51-57; the description of a longitudinal bore instead of a groove or the longitudinally split segments would both provide an opening connected with the outer surface by a slit prior to actuation of the packer); wherein the opening encloses the cable prior to and after the swelling has occurred (col. 2, lines 51-57, the longitudinally split segments would enclose the wire before actuation); wherein the opening may have variable longitudinal extension or variable cross-section (these features are considered obvious over the disclosure of Lembcke since one of ordinary skill in the art being enabled to produce the device of Lembcke would also be enabled to provide the opening as any dimensions a particular

Art Unit: 3672

application may require). Lembcke et al. also disclose a method of extending a cable longitudinally through a packer comprising: providing a swellable packer including a seal material having an opening extending longitudinally through the seal material, and a longitudinal slit extending between the opening and an external surface of the packer and inserting a cable through the slit (fig 1) and swelling the seal to cause the seal to seal about the cable in the opening (fig 2).

Lembcke et al. do not disclose the seal material as swelling and increasing in volume in response to contact with a swell-activating material. Laflin et al. disclose a packer including a seal material which swells and thereby increases in volume in response to contact with a swell-activating material (col. 3, lines 16-19) wherein the swell activating material comprises water (col. 3, lines 56-62). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to replace the seal of Lembcke et al. with the swellable material of Laflin et al. since the Laflin et al. suggest such a substitution (col. 3, lines 63+) and it has been held that the substitution of a known element for another to obtain predictable results is obvious to one of ordinary skill.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lembcke et al. (US 6,173,788) in view of Freyer (WO 02/20941). Lembcke et al. disclose a method of extending a cable longitudinally through a packer comprising: providing a swellable packer including a seal material having an opening extending longitudinally through the seal material, and a longitudinal slit extending between the

Art Unit: 3672

opening and an external surface of the packer prior to actuation of the packer (col. 2, lines 48-57 describe embodiments which require such) and inserting a cable through the slit (fig 1) and swelling the seal to cause the seal to seal about the cable in the opening (fig 2). Lembcke et al. do not disclose the seal material as swelling and increasing in volume in response to contact with a swell-activating material, wherein the material comprises hydrocarbons. Freyer discloses a packer material which swells by absorption of hydrocarbons to form an annular wellbore seal (abstract). It would have been obvious at the time of invention to substitute the hydrocarbon absorbing packer material of Freyer for the packer material of Lembcke et al. to arrive at the instant invention since the simply substitution of one known element for another to obtain predictable results has been held as obvious to one of ordinary skill.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 3672

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Andrews whose telephone number is (571)272-6558. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Bagnell can be reached on (571)272-6999. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3672

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/David J. Bagnell/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3672

DLA
1/14/10